



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,676	07/30/2003	Kenji Sato	SUT-0223	6542
23353	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			TANINGCO, MARCUS H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2878	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/629,676	SATO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marcus H. Taningco	2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4-6,8,10,11,15,18-22,25,27,29,30 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2,3,7,9,12-14,16,17,23,24,26,28,31-33, and 39-42 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 18-22, 25, 27, 29, 30 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (JP 09-009153).

Re claim 1, Lee et al. teaches a radiation detector (Fig. 1) comprising: a radiation sensitive semiconductor **8** [0036]; a common electrode **9** formed on one surface of said semiconductor **8** for receiving bias voltage [0035]; electrodes **23** and **25** on the other surface of said semiconductor **8** for outputting charges generated within said semiconductor **8** by the incident radiation [0031]; and a light source **22L** and a light panels **22F** and **22S** [0036].

Re claim 4 as applied to claim 1, Lee et al. teaches a semiconductor **8** comprising amorphous selenium [0034].

Re claim 5 as applied to claim 1, Lee et al. teaches a semiconductor **8** comprising CdTe [0034].

Re claims 6 and 10 as applied to claim 1, Lee et al. teaches a light source **22L** and light panels **22F** and **22S** [0036].

Re claims 8 and 11, Lee et al. teaches a light source **22L** and light panels **22F** and **22S** directly emitting radiation, which has the wavelength in the range of 400-800 nanometers [0036].

Art Unit: 2878

Re claim 15, Lee et al. teaches a radiation detector (Fig. 1) comprising: a radiation sensitive semiconductor **8** [0036]; a common electrode **9** formed on one surface of said semiconductor **8** for receiving bias voltage [0035]; electrodes **23** and **25** on the other surface of said semiconductor **8** for outputting charges generated within said semiconductor **8** by the incident radiation [0031]; a carrier selective layer between said semiconductor **8** and electrodes **23** and **25** [0032]; and a light source **22L** and a light panels **22F** and **22S** [0036].

Re claims 18 and 20 as applied to claim 15, Lee et al. teaches a semiconductor **8** comprising amorphous selenium [0034].

Re claims 19, 21, and 22 as applied to claim 15, Lee et al. teaches a semiconductor **8** comprising CdTe [0034].

Re claims 25 and 29 as applied to claim 15, Lee et al. teaches a light source **22L** and light panels **22F** and **22S** [0036].

Re claims 27 and 30, Lee et al. teaches a light source **22L** and light panels **22F** and **22S** directly emitting radiation, which has the wavelength in the range of 400-800 nanometers [0036].

Re claims 34 and 36 as applied to claims 1 and 15, lee et al. teaches a semiconductor formed on a TFT substrate **7** having TFT switches **14n** and charge storage capacitors on a transparent substrate [0031].

Re claims 35 and 37, Lee et al. teaches electrodes **23** and **25** transparent to said light [0009].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al.

Re claim 38 as applied to claims 1 and 15, Lee et al. discloses the claimed invention except for an on/off switch. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee et al. with an on/off switch since it was known in the art that electronic devices have on/off switches.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-14 and 16-42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 2 recites the limitation of a light having a wavelength shorter than a wavelength corresponding to a band gap energy of the semiconductor used.

Claim 3 recites the limitation of light having a wavelength shorter than a wavelength that halves a transmittance of said semiconductor used, and longer than a wavelength corresponding to band gap energy of a semiconductor.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 4/6/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant's main argument is that Lee et al. fails to disclose the features of claim 1, namely the limitation wherein the radiation detector comprises a light irradiating mechanism for emitting light at least during a detection of the radiation. However, Lee et al. discloses in paragraph [0036] an exposure means (irradiating mechanism), which is effective when removing the residual charge that can make a false image from the exposure process. Furthermore, Lee et al. discloses that the exposure means, luminescence panels **22f, 22s** (Drawings 2 and 3), may be supplied to remove all residual charge at the time of an image pick up and reading [0039-0043]. Furthermore, in response to Applicant's argument that Lee et al. does not include certain features of the Applicant's invention, the limitations on which the Applicant relies (i.e., Functions and Effects cited on page 12 of Applicant's remarks) are not stated in the claims. It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc.*, 7 USPQ2d 1064. Therefore the Examiner maintains the rejection.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2878

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus H. Taningco whose telephone number is (571) 272-1848. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MT



DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800